DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 356 HE 001 270

TITLE Recommendations for the Governance of Wesleyan University.
INSTITUTION Wesleyan Univ., Middletown, Conn.
PUB DATE 6 Sep 69
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.15
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Policy, *Governance, *Governing Boards, Governmental Structure, *Higher Education, *Student Participation, *Trustees
IDENTIFIERS *Wesleyan University

ABSTRACT

This report follows a reappraisal of the size, functions and purposes of Wesleyan's Board of Trustees. The Committee recommended that Wesleyan maintain: (1) a "working Board" organized so as to foster direct engagement of trustees with students and faculty members; (2) a relatively small and stable Board consisting of recent graduate, older and non-alumni; (3) a Board that was open in its deliberations and responsive to the community; (4) a Board that placed a high priority on supporting a flexible, innovative administrative structure; and (5) a Board with a committee system that permitted careful discharge of fiduciary responsibilities so that the Board as a whole could debate policy questions and help define educational objectives. (JS)

ED035356

Recommendations for the Governance of Wesleyan University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 270

Approved by the Board of Trustees
September 6, 1969
Middletown, Connecticut

ED035356

Wesleyan University

Report of Special Committee

August 27, 1969

For: The Board of Trustees

Subject: Governance of the University

This committee, appointed a year ago, has met frequently both in private sessions and with campus people, including students and faculty members. It has also consulted with chairmen of the Board's committees and with several other trustees.

The committee was first requested to review the role of the Board: its responsibilities, its size and structure, and its relationship to the campus community. Later, the committee was asked to consider aspects of the University's administrative structure in the light of the prevailing situation in academic institutions and the identifiable needs of Wesleyan.

Attached are (1) an introductory comment, (2) recommendations related to the Board, (3) recommendations related to the administration, and (4) a committee report explaining its premises and the reasons for its most important proposals.

It is suggested that decisions the Board may make on September 6th be reported promptly to students, faculty and alumni. The Board may also wish to authorize distribution of this report to the University community.

Julian D. Anthony
Robert S. Cohen
John W. Macy, Jr.
James J. O'Leary
Philip B. Brown, Chairman

Enclosures

Introductory Comment

The duty of the Board of Trustees is to help preserve and strengthen the University as an effective educational institution: to help faculty, students and administration sustain a distinctive educational enterprise responsive to the existing and foreseeable needs of students and of society. To that end, the Committee is of the opinion that Wesleyan should maintain:

(1) a "working Board" organized so as to foster direct engagement of trustees with students and faculty members;

(2) a relatively small and stable Board consisting of recent graduates, older alumni and non-alumni who, together, can bring broad perspective and specific experience to the deliberation of policy questions;

(3) a Board which is open in its deliberations and responsive to the Wesleyan community;

(4) a Board which places a high priority on the maintenance and support of a flexible, innovative administrative structure to help the institution pace, and not merely follow, promising change in higher education; and

(5) a Board with a committee system that permits efficient and careful discharge of fiduciary responsibilities so that the Board as a whole can debate policy questions and help define coherent educational objectives.

Ten years ago, the Board effected a reorganization program marked especially by a reduction in the number of active trustees. The current reappraisal relates less to size than to function, purpose and people: to the opportunity to draw the Board into a closer working relationship with students and faculty members.

The recommended program would preserve the integrity of established relationships, but would also be a significant step toward the ultimate objective foreseen by the committee in its discussions: a form of University governance which will effectively represent a blend of people (students, faculty, administration and trustees) rather than a linkage of essentially separate bodies.

The recommended changes in the administrative structure are also designed both in terms of long-range objectives and to establish, as promptly as possible, a better balanced and more realistic system of campus governance. The need for these changes, and the premises for the program as a whole, are discussed in the committee's report.

(Recommendations and Report Follow)

Recommendations -- Board of Trustees

Recommendation I: That there be a Chairman and two Vice Chairmen of the Board of Trustees (eliminating the titles of President and Vice President of the Board).

Recommendation II:

A. That there be nine (instead of six) Alumni Trustees elected (for three-year terms) in a new procedure which would (1) increase the number of trustees from 26 to 29, and (2) assure the election of from three to six younger alumni (ages 21 to 32). Two slates would be submitted:

(1) One slate of nominees from classes eleven or more years past graduation.

(2) One slate of nominees from classes ten or less years past graduation.

Each alumnus would have three votes. The nominee on each slate receiving the highest number of votes would be elected. The nominee on either slate who finished second on that slate (but who received more votes than the person who finished second on the other slate) would be elected. There would be a special election of three additional alumni to begin the program.

B. That members of the senior class be eligible for nomination on the ground that they will be alumni by the time they would serve.

C. That the Alumni Council be asked to place at least one senior on its Nominating Committee through a selection procedure it develops with the college body or senior class officers.

D. That seniors be eligible to vote in the election on the ground that they will be alumni by the time those elected take office.

Comment: The current positions (26) are needed to retain and strengthen a representative Board. Three

additions, bringing younger voices (with votes) to the Board, would widen the age span. A Charter amendment would be necessary to permit these additions, and the program must be approved and implemented by the Alumni Council in consultation with students as well as with the Board.

Recommendation III: That there be six standing committees of the Board as follows: Group I -- Financial Planning, Facilities, Investment; Group II -- Education, Nominations, Student Affairs.

Recommendation IV:

A. That each of the standing committees other than the Nominating Committee be structured as follows:

(1) Four or more active trustees (in addition to the Chairman of the Committee) appointed by the Board.

(2) Two faculty members (perhaps one with tenure, one not with tenure) appointed as the faculty may determine either from counterpart committees of the faculty (E.P.C., Student Affairs, etc.) or -- where there is no counterpart -- in the light of qualifications for the assignment.

(3) Two undergraduates appointed as the students may determine. (If there were no counterpart committee with student members, the College Body Committee could ask students to volunteer, interview or otherwise survey those interested, and make appointments. Upperclassmen might be given preference.)

(4) Other non-trustee members appointed by the Board on recommendation of the Nominating Committee.

Comment: Standing committees should not be unduly large in number or in size. Accordingly, it is suggested that only active trustees be appointed, that four trustees in addition to the chairman of the committee be the norm (but not a minimum requirement),

that Emeritus Trustees be involved through specialized assignments rather than through direct standing committee assignments, and that subcommittees (e.g., a Subcommittee on Dormitory Life of the Student Affairs Committee) be established from time to time to provide opportunities for broadened trustee, faculty and student participation. Emeritus Trustees could be invited to serve on such subcommittees as their interests and schedules might permit. The Board can also appoint ad hoc committees as appropriate.

B. That every standing committee member be entitled to vote in the committee.

C. That all members of committees, including faculty members and students, be entitled to attend Board meetings (other than executive sessions) and to be recognized during discussions.

D. That each standing committee elect a trustee as its Vice Chairman.

E. That the Financial Planning Committee be organized as in A through D, but that its trustee members be drawn from each of the other committees to assure effective liaison.

F. That from three to five trustee members of the Investment Committee be designated as a Portfolio Subcommittee and that they be empowered to name one or more advisers who would sit with the Subcommittee but not vote.

Comment: Policy questions would be discussed and acted upon by the full committee, including faculty and student members.

G. That the Nominating Committee consist of five trustees who will consult -- in accordance with the existing By-Laws -- with the Chairman of the Board and the President of the University.

H. That the Chairman and the President be ex officio members of all committees other than the Nominating Committee, in accordance with current practice.

Recommendation V: That one Vice Chairman of the Board be the liaison officer with (and an ex officio member of) Group I Committees, and one with (and of) Group II Committees.

> Comment: Each Vice Chairman would help coordinate work among the committees in his group and would review agendas to help avoid lapses or oversights. In addition, each Vice Chairman would work with the campus official having primary responsibility for a group of committees.

Recommendation VI: That an Agenda Committee, with power to prepare the agenda for Board meetings but with no other power, consist of the Chairman, the Vice Chairmen, the Secretary of the Board, and the Chairmen of standing committees. The President of the University would preside.

> Comment: This confirms current practice. Other Board members and campus officials would be invited as appropriate per current procedures.

Recommendation VII: That the President of the University and one other trustee be designated annually to meet with three faculty members appointed by the faculty and three students (perhaps officers of the graduating class) and request recommendations to the Board for speakers at Commencement and at the Baccalaureate Service, and for those to receive honorary degrees.

> Comment: Since the Commencement is an event primarily for graduating students, their advice (particularly as to speaker) and that of the faculty (particularly as to honorary degrees) would be sought on behalf of the Board. The honorary degree should be given as a recognition by Wesleyan of accomplishment or unusual promise, and the speakers should qualify both on that basis and as individuals graduates will want to hear.

Recommendation VIII: That the President of the University be responsible for recommending development (capital gifts solicitation) objectives and

for suggesting a structure (Chairman, Co-Chairman, Area Chairmen, Area Committees, etc.) to be established by the Board, and that he be similarly responsible for alumni relations programs.

> Comment: At this stage, it is best to call on individual trustees for guidance as an overall development strategy is debated. The officers of the Board and the current Chairman of the Development Committee (which would be eliminated for the time being) should provide guidance. Key positions might be occupied by non-trustees as well as by trustees. The emphasis on alumni relations should be a matter of continuing priority for both the Board and the administration.

Recommendation IX: That the Nominating Committee be empowered to appoint, at the request of any standing committee, certain trustees to serve as "liaison trustees." The particular goal is to take advantage of the experience and interests of Emeritus Trustees, but all trustees would be eligible. Each person so designated (e.g., as Liaison Trustee for the Press, for the MAT Program, the Library) would report to the appropriate committee (in the cases cited, to the Education Committee) and to the Board from time to time.

> Comment: The number of trustees on standing committees would be limited to sharpen efficiency and to permit faculty-student participation without creating overly large meeting groups. But the Board's efficiency -- and its coverage during a meeting weekend -- would be increased by Liaison Trustees. Although active members of the Board would be eligible, it is the particular intention to draw on the experience of Emeritus Trustees. A limited number of appointments would be appropriate at the outset of the program.

Recommendation X: That the Chairman of the Alumni Council or his delegate be invited to attend Board meetings, other than executive sessions, and to participate in discussions.

Recommendation XI: That the number of regular Board meetings be four (rather than five) per year; that they be open in the sense that faculty and student committee members (and others on or advising committees) be invited to attend; and that the Chairman be empowered to invite other faculty and student representatives to attend.

> Comment: Certain committees (e.g., Education, Financial Planning and Facilities) may wish to meet between Board meetings as necessary to retain close touch with campus matters and to take or approve actions subject to Board ratification.

Recommendation XII: That in place of the fifth meeting, there be an annual (usually midwinter) informal session during which trustees and campus officials can discuss major policy questions informally and in depth.

> Comment: The purpose is to permit more meaningful and less formal discussion than is possible during a time-limited agenda meeting. Actions could be proposed, but not taken, except that routine actions could be handled through a short formal session if necessary. If so, minutes would be available to others (faculty and students) who attend regular meetings. The informal session would ordinarily be off campus, but near campus, and could be attended by others (faculty, students, "outsiders") as the subjects for discussion might warrant.

Recommendation XIII: That the category of Adviser to the Board be reconsidered by the Nominating Committee in the light of the total reorganization plan, but that there be no changes for the time being.

Recommendation XIV: That committee chairmanships be rotated regularly on the basis of a plan (but not a rigid system) worked out by the Board officers and suggested to the Board.

Recommendations -- Administration

Reorganization of the Administration is needed to:

(1) reemphasize the faculty's responsibility for the academic enterprise and for student life;

(2) increase the likelihood of close cooperation among faculty, administration, students and trustees as policy questions are defined and decided;

(3) effect administrative delegations so that the President and other senior officials can give more time to significant policy questions, management structure, outside relations, important personnel recruitment and resource development.

The establishment of two new senior positions, to support the President and to accept extensive administrative responsibility by delegation from him, is recommended as follows:

(1) Chancellor of the University as the officer responsible for the development and implementation of academic policies and programs, and for student affairs (appointed by the Board, on nomination of a faculty-student committee and with the advice of the President, for a four-year term); and

(2) Executive Vice President as the officer responsible for planning and administration in support of the academic enterprise and for community relations (appointed by the Board on nomination of the President).

More comprehensive definitions of responsibility and authority, written in accordance with the committee's report, would be set forth in the By-Laws and in position descriptions prepared by the President and made available to the Board from time to time.

Both the Chancellor and the Executive Vice President would, as in the case of all other officers appointed pursuant to the By-Laws, serve at all times at the pleasure of the Board. In the case of the Chancellor, a four-year renewable term would be established to permit a campus committee and the Board -- every four years -- to reexamine the situation through a new nomination and appointment process.

The Committee has discussed the question of continuity of management and has concluded that the proposed structure would give Wesleyan greater depth and more protection against lapses in leadership when retirements or resignations occur.

Election of the Chancellor

The Chancellor would be nominated and appointed this year, to take office no later than July 1, 1970, and the process would be repeated every four years thereafter.

The faculty would designate a Nominating Committee (to consist of faculty members and students) which would consider members of the Wesleyan faculty or, if it saw fit in any election year, "recruit" someone to join the faculty as Chancellor. By November 1st of an election year, the Nominating Committee would submit from one to three names to the Board of Trustees.

The Nominating Committee could use any procedures approved by the faculty -- closed or open meetings or both, surveys, polls, etc. -- to identify student and faculty opinion. It would be charged by the Board with the responsibility of naming one or more persons who would have student and faculty support and who, in its judgment, could make substantial creative contributions to the University. A specific requirement would be that the Nominating Committee confer with the President at the outset of its deliberations and that it advise the Board, with respect to each person nominated, whether or not the President has expressed concurrence.

The Board would reserve the right to remove a Chancellor and to appoint an Acting Chancellor whenever a vacancy occurred. The Board would also reserve the right to ask for additional names after receiving a Nominating Committee report, but would not appoint a Chancellor on its own motion unless the Nominating Committee (1) failed to submit any names on a timely basis, or (2) failed to submit additional names on request.

As a transitional step, it is recommended that the Board:

(1) define responsibilities (through By-Law changes) and (a) appoint (or provide for the prompt appointment of) a Chancellor Pro Tem to serve for one year or until his successor is appointed and takes office, and (b) appoint an Executive Vice President;

(2) ask the faculty (a) to consider the new administrative structure in working out its own governmental arrangements this fall, and (b) to establish a Nominating Committee, so constituted and designated through such procedures as it may determine; and

(3) ask the Committee to nominate a candidate or candidates for the first four-year term no later than November 1, 1969.

Related personnel comments and recommendations will be made at the September 6th meeting.

The administrative program does not require a revised Charter. Resolutions adopted by the Board can be confirmed through By-Law changes which would be proposed promptly after the Board reaches its decisions. There will be flexibility to consider subsequent changes as they may be suggested by trustees, faculty or students.

Discussion

There is creative ferment in all Wesleyan constituencies. Students, many of whom are disinterested in traditional concepts of student government, nonetheless often want to help shape decisions traditionally reserved to the faculty or the Board. A faculty-student planning committee is considering innovations looking toward an effective campus system of "shared responsibility." The Board is seeking ways to close ranks with students and faculty: to approach a concept of "university" (or "community") as a basis for a decision-making structure most people will respect.

These deliberations at Wesleyan reflect the general need for new models of governance in higher education.

The current faculty-student discussions present the most difficult challenge and hold the greatest potential. But the Board can help, both by reorienting its own position and by providing for more realistic balance in the administrative structure.

Board Reorganization

Trustees have dual roles as fiduciaries and as managers. But trustees do not "manage" by making "decisions" often attributed to them. In practice, they are too often hemmed in by decisions effectively made on campus. The budget, for example, is a build-up document representing dozens of decisions by campus people. Trustees eventually confirm -- perhaps with slight adjustments -- the total decision.

Student interest in Board membership probably reflects false impressions concerning the Board's "power." Boards are at fault to the extent that they have been needlessly mysterious in their deliberations. One result is that trustees have only limited opportunities to participate within, and not simply at the end of, the decision-making process.

Trustees should not be "wasted": they should probe for information individually and through committees, influence campus thinking, help maintain procedural safeguards, and -- as a Board -- concentrate on important policy questions.

It has been said that trustees should concentrate on their legal duties: select the president, evaluate the management, hold the assets, act as a court of last resort, maintain balance between competing constituencies and relate the institution to society.*

If trustees are to be informed in their approach to such responsibilities, they must have regular contact with students and faculty members. The goal should be to develop joint solutions to common problems.

Principally through committee work, the Wesleyan Board familiarizes itself with trends and helps shape policy decisions. Committees often meet with faculty and students to gain the advantage of first-hand impressions and advice. By inviting faculty and students to serve on committees, the Board will confirm its essential attitude toward its responsibilities and tap the richer potential of a decision-making process based on mutual responsibility rather than staged dialogue.

With fundamental changes in the student population (women, minority group students) current alumni cannot be fully representative. The Board's new appointments help shift the emphasis (five non-alumni, including women and black people, will be trustees). Implementation of the program to assure the election of younger alumni (from age 21 to age 32) will greatly broaden the Board's perspective.

In summary, the essential goals of the reorganization program are to engage current faculty and students in the decision-making processes of the Board through voting memberships on committees; to enable these individuals to participate in open Board meeting discussions of recommendations they or others help formulate; to bring a wider range of experience and attitude to the Board; and to give younger alumni an opportunity to influence both the Board and the campus as trustees.

The Administration

First-rate people, with academic and other backgrounds, are needed in administrative posts. But such people will not accept or hold positions if they are made to feel apart from the central enterprise or from the people -- faculty and students -- of the university. Nor will

---

*Morton A. Rauh, Vice President of Antioch, in an essay published by the College.

administrators remain if their schedules are so complicated as to make family life impossible. There is a risk of a mass exodus of presidents and deans from administrations across the country. People in other administrative posts would follow.

Administrators who simply brace themselves to withstand emotional pressures as long as they can will not solve problems any more effectively than those who leave.

The difficulties confronting college administrators are not merely the result of student or faculty "alienation." There is throughout higher education a considerable degree of confusion or default because administrative arrangements are generally not well conceived. In such a situation, the administration inevitably plays one of two roles: that of witless witness to drift and sometimes near disaster; or that of occasional superauthority making, and blamed for, decisions others cannot or will not make.

The consequences of continued unrest and of pressure for change, if there is no better response than a rigid adherence to established patterns, are easy to predict. Presidents and other administrators will neglect at least some crucial responsibilities; trustees and faculties will be frustrated in their attempts to help maintain reasonable institutional coherence and stability; student-faculty alienation from administrations will increase; and student discontent and frustration will mount.

A strong effort to improve the situation is warranted in these times when the fate of the small university is at issue financially and educationally; when students often see themselves as part of a broad movement rather than as constituents of one college; when many faculty members see better reasons for loyalty to their fields (or guilds) than to their institutions; and when trustees are expecting more than they get from college administrators.

One fundamental consideration is the fact that effective delegation is difficult in an academic community. Faculty members, students and others want to reach the person finally in charge on matters important to them. Personal responses are often necessary and always appropriate. No single person can be fully responsive, but three senior officers -- each carefully selected in the light of requirements for the office -- can broaden the personality of the institution.

Under the new system, administrative and related policy-making responsibilities are to be divided between the Chancellor and the Executive Vice President, who are to have final authority in all administrative matters and to speak as well as act for the University on policy questions within their areas of responsibility. They in turn will delegate in support of a strong effort to speed and improve decision-making processes throughout the administration. The President is not to be an appeal point on administrative matters, but is to work with the senior officers and others -- in a partnership sense -- to resolve difficult questions, coordinate policy decisions and help maintain effective procedures.

The need for better administrative balance cannot be overstated. Wesleyan is a "turned-on" institution. But it could experience failure or loss of quality if financial support for planned and started programs (and buildings) is not adequate and if there is too little time for in-the-field recruitment for senior faculty and administrative personnel. Alumni, foundations and corporations must be reached effectively; policies developed in consultation with the faculty, the students and the Board must be realistic as well as educationally sound; strong faculty appointments must be made; and there must be a continuing effort to draw trustees, faculty, students, alumni and parents into increasingly harmonious relationships.

Unusually significant projects are underway at Wesleyan: a priorities study, a review of academic standards, consideration of advanced learning programs, changes in student-faculty government structures, a newly organized Board, the Center for the Humanities, the Afro-American Institute, the introduction of coeducation, and others. It is important that senior administrators have time to work with faculty and students, as well as with trustees, as policies are developed and implemented.

Students and Faculty

Student alienation from society (the Establishment, bigness, impersonality, bureaucracy, preoccupation with things rather than with human needs) is pointed at nearest targets: the university itself and activities it permits or sponsors. No campus will be free of pressure. But the college that listens openly and responds flexibly will come closest to making itself an establishment for students: a personal, small-seeming,

unbureaucratic, humane place. It will do this with students -- with their guidance and their consent -- or not at all.

Many students are wary of participation in student government even as they press for participation in university decision-making. The more permanent members of the university should invite participation with the realization that decisions are apt to be better even if the students who take part are not fully representative, and with the hope that a more effective student government will be one result.

A faculty-student committee is planning a government format with the following objectives:

(1) to involve non-tenured faculty and students in committee work to a greater extent;

(2) to avoid both duplications and oversights in committee work;

(3) to minimize faculty involvement in trivial matters, focusing its attention on policy questions; and

(4) to involve faculty and students in certain areas (e.g., financial planning) on a more formal and meaningful basis.

In addition, the committee is to recommend a new governing body. Alternatives under consideration are:

(1) a Faculty Senate (with student representatives) to conduct some of the business now reserved to the full faculty; or

(2) a University Council to provide a forum for policy discussions leading to recommendations to the faculty, the Board, or the administration; or

(3) some combination of these.

The faculty-student committee hopes, in any case, to heighten cooperation between faculty and students; to establish a body which can help cope with crises; and to eliminate some of the distrust faculty and students feel for administrators.

The work initiated by the faculty reflects a range of concerns: about its internal democracy (tenure versus non-tenure); its relations with students; its "power" as Wesleyan grows and administrative complexity becomes more baffling or irritating; and its need to have effective control over the academic enterprise. The direction is promising, but there are fundamental problems not likely to be solved by steps now contemplated.

Most faculty members feel and demonstrate strong loyalty to Wesleyan. Individually and through their departments and programs, they meet responsibilities for teaching and scholarship in unusually creative ways. But faculties generally find it difficult, as corporate bodies, to exercise responsibility for the total welfare of the college. In part, the problem relates to cumbersome campus government and this fact helps explain the current study of alternatives. But the problem is also one of attitude. The "administration" is often perceived as something apart: a threat, a necessary encumbrance, a sparring partner. The "us-them" syndrome dominates the rhetoric of some faculty members nearly as often (and bluntly) as it does that of some undergraduates. Faculty members in administrative posts are apt to be viewed -- in some cases, by some people -- as ex-colleagues for the duration; and "the administration" is expected to lead by those who may be disinclined to follow.

The essential continuing strength of a small institution like Wesleyan is in its faculty. If the faculty can <u>feel and be</u> responsible for the institution, students will be affected deeply. For example, as long as a disruption is the administration's problem, disruption is likely; as long as the Board is a foreign body, indiscriminate pressure for new (often expensive) programs is inevitable; as long as the faculty is suspicious of the administration, a divided institution will waste vital energies in tugs of war over both policy and administrative questions.

<u>Responsibility cannot exist without commensurate authority. The faculty must be organized to exercise greater authority and thus to assume greater responsibility. The faculty and students must see the administration as an extension of their own responsibilities to the institution: as a function of and for the faculty; on behalf of students; responsible both directly and through the Board to the larger society; concerned with the total scholarly enterprise.</u>

Selection of a Chancellor nominated for the faculty by a faculty-student committee will not produce an instant change in attitude. But it may help foster better understanding and cooperation. Selection of an Executive Vice President, to work with the Chancellor and President, will not in itself solve problems. But the more efficient and precise management of increasingly complex functions in direct support of the academic enterprise should help reduce the tensions associated with administrative complication or inefficiency.

Students and faculty often feel they are "walking through glue" when they seek administrative action. A sounder fundamental organization will lead to more extensive delegations, faster and better decisions and -- because of delegation -- a smaller and more efficient administration.

Although the main objective is to improve cooperation and understanding, a related goal is to develop a lean, professional and stable (but lively and innovative) administration. Personnel turnover is a problem. But the difficult quandary is the conflict between a need for academically professional administrators and the loss to teaching and scholarship when faculty members accept administrative posts.

The Committee has reviewed an approach -- for faculty and student consideration -- whereby a limited number of tenure and non-tenure faculty members could accept short term (and part time) responsibilities at the key points of contact: admissions, counseling of students, faculty recruitment and curricular development. As associates of (or advisers to) the Chancellor, these faculty members could work with those who report to the Chancellor (Deans and Provost) within a smaller permanent administration.

It might be possible to augment the faculty if a plan of this sort were adopted and to develop the logical extension of the plan: more systematized student involvement in certain types of administrative work.

Conclusion

Although the Committee does not think the "last word" has been spoken on governance at Wesleyan or in higher education, it does view the total program as one which can be highly effective

at Wesleyan and significant as a model for other institutions. The Committee hopes that the total program can be implemented and announced as promptly and as affirmatively as possible.

Julian D. Anthony
Robert S. Cohen
John W. Macy, Jr.
James J. O'Leary
Philip B. Brown, Chairman

August 28, 1969